REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed April 7, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the above-submitted amendments, and to consider the below-submitted remarks in view of the amendments.

Art-Based Rejections

The rejection in the first Office Action have been repeated. In particular, some of the claims are rejected as being anticipated by Robertson, whereas others of the claims are rejected as being obvious over the combination of Robertson and Call or Robertson and Loeb. Applicant has amended the independent claims, and it is respectfully submitted that Robertson does not disclose at least some of the elements of the claims (now amended) rejected as anticipated by Robertson. In addition, the obviousness rejections rely on the same premise with regard to Robertson as the Examiner asserts in making the anticipation rejection. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Robertson with either Call or Loeb fails to disclose the subject matter recited in the claims (now amended) rejected as being obvious.

The Examiner continues to contend that Robertson discloses "second memory means that stores a password used to authenticate a giver who desires to give the gift on a network." Applicant has amended the independent claims. Specifically, taking claim 1 as an example, Applicant has added language to the claim to clarify that the password used by the giver, that allows the wish list to be referred to by the giver, is registered by the registrant of the wish list and transmitted to the giver. Similar language has been added to independent claims 16, 17, 19, 24 and 25.

On the contrary, as the Examiner recognizes, the password potentially employed by a gift giver using the Robertson system is a password that is generated as a result of a transaction between the user (i.e. the giver) and the Registrar. (It is noted that, in Robertson, a password is not even required of a non—registered user.) Robertson does not disclose the giver password registered by a registrant of the wish list and transmitted to the giver so as to allow secure access to the wish list by the giver without the giver's registration.

The references relied upon by the Examiner in making the obviousness rejections are not relied upon for the "second memory means" feature and, therefore, do not support a rejection of the amended claims.

For at least the above reasons, then, Applicant respectfully submits that the anticipation and obviousness rejections are insufficient and should be withdrawn.

9

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300

10